

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-17 were previously pending in the application. Claims 5-7 and 15-17 are canceled; claims 1, 4, 8, 9, 10, and 14 are amended; and new claims 18-25 are added herein. Assuming the entry of this amendment, claims 1-4, 8-14, and 18-25 are now pending in the application. The Applicant hereby requests further examination and reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and these remarks.

Miscellaneous Amendments

The Specification has been amended to correct inadvertent typographical errors on pages 27 and 52.

Claims 4 and 14 have been amended to replace “if” with “when” for improved clarity. These amendments were not made to overcome any cited prior art references.

Claims 8 and 9 have been amended to depend from amended claim 1 and to clarify their claimed features with respect to amended claim 1. In particular, “also generated” has been replaced by “assigned,” and “a form of a” has been eliminated. These amendments were not made to overcome any cited prior art references.

Claim 10 has been amended to correct an inadvertent typographical error to clarify the claimed feature in light of the amendment to claim 9. This amendment was not made to overcome any cited prior art references.

Claim 14 has been amended to more clearly describe the claimed features, *i.e.*, to more clearly indicate that the path costs and link costs features recited in claim 14 relate to the K minimum-cost candidate primary paths. Claim 14 has also been amended in light of the amendments to claim 1 to clarify that the second specified threshold used in calculating link costs for candidate primary paths does not have to be the same as the specified threshold used in calculating link costs for candidate restoration paths. These amendments were not made to overcome any cited prior art references.

Allowable Subject Matter

In page 14, the Examiner indicated that claims 7, 12, 14 are directed to allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Prior-Art Rejections

In pages 2-10, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-6, 8-9, 13, and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2003/0147352 A1 to Ishibashi et al. in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,904,462 to Sinha. In pages 10-11, the Examiner rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over a combined Ishibashi-Sinha system in view of U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2007/0011284 to Le Roux et al. In pages 11-13, the Examiner rejected claims 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over a combined Ishibashi-Sinha system in view of U.S. Pat. No. 7,099,286 to Swallow.

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of originally filed claim 7 and all intervening claims. Claim 1 has also been amended for improved clarity of the claimed subject matter. Support for amended claim 1 can be found in originally filed claims 1, 5, 6, and 7, as well as the Specification at page 30, lines 22-29. Specifically, the table below shows where support can be found for each segment of amended claim 1.

Line(s) of Amended Claim 1	Support
1-4	Originally filed claim 1, lines 1-4
18-19	Originally filed claim 5, lines 1-2
20-27	Originally filed claim 1, lines 5-12
28-29	Specification at page 30, lines 22-29
30-31	Originally filed claim 5, lines 3-4
31-32	Originally filed claim 6, line 1
33-39	Originally filed claim 7, lines 1-6
40-41	Originally filed claim 5, lines 5-6, and originally-filed claim 1, lines 13-14
42-43	Originally filed claim 5, line 7, and originally-filed claim 1, lines 15-16

Applicant submits that claim 1 is allowable for at least some of the same reasons that originally filed claim 7 was directed to allowable subject matter. Since claims 2-4 and 8-14

depend variously from amended claim 1, Applicant further submits that those claims are also allowable.

Claim 18

New claim 18 is equivalent to originally filed claim 12, rewritten in independent form, including the limitations of all intervening claims, but with instances of “if” replaced by “when.” Support for new claim 18 can be found in originally filed claims 1, 11, and 12. Applicant submits that new claim 18 is allowable for at least some of the same reasons that originally filed claim 12 was directed to allowable subject matter.

Claim 19

New claim 19 is equivalent to originally filed claim 14, rewritten in independent form, with modifications to more clearly describe the claimed features, *i.e.*, (1) to more clearly indicate that certain path costs and link costs features recited in claim 19 relate to the K minimum-cost candidate primary paths and (2) , to replace instances of “if” by “when.”. Support for new claim 19 can be found in originally filed claims 1, 13, and 14. Applicant submits that new claim 19 is allowable for at least some of the same reasons that originally filed claim 14 was directed to allowable subject matter.

Claim 20

New claim 20 is supported by the Specification at page 32, lines 4-21, and Fig. 13. New claim 20 recites some of the same features as originally filed claim 5. Applicant submits that none of the cited references, individually or in combination, teach all of the recited elements of claim 20. In particular, the cited references do not teach a method for determining a minimum-cost restoration path, where the method includes, for each link of a specified set of links, assigning an initial cost to the link and reducing the link’s cost when it is determined that the link’s bandwidth can be shared with a new restoration path.

Thus, Applicant submits that new claim 20 is allowable over the cited references. For similar reasons, applicant submits that new claim 24 is also allowable over the cited references. Since new claims 21-23 depend variously from claim 20, and new claim 25 depends from new claim 24, it is further submitted that those claims are also allowable over the cited references.

Claim 21

New claim 21, which depends from claim 20, is supported by originally filed claim 1, by the Specification at page 29, line 5-page 30, line 20, and by Fig. 13.

Claim 22

New claim 22, which depends from claim 21, is supported by the Specification at page 31, lines 30-32, and Fig. 13. Applicant submits that none of the cited references, individually or in combination, teach the recited features of new claim 22. In particular, none of the cited references teach an exclusion of links in the network that are not SRLG-disjoint from the links of the new primary path, where that exclusion is accomplished by assigning an infinite initial cost to those links. Applicant submits that this provides further grounds for the allowability of new claim 22 over the cited references.

Claim 23

New claim 23, which depends from claim 20, is supported by the Specification at page 31, lines 3-18, and Fig. 12.

Claim 24

New claim 24, which is directed to a network manager for a mesh network, is supported by the Specification at page 32, lines 4-21, and Fig. 13.

Claim 25

New claim 25, which depends from claim 24, is supported by the Specification at page 3, lines 4-13. The recited features of claim 25 allow for the amount of protection bandwidth reserved on the first link to be less than the sum of the bandwidths of the two or more different primary paths. In particular, this is allowable by the feature that “the network manager makes use of sharing information to determine how much protection bandwidth to reserve on the first link for the two or more restoration paths in such a way that the restoration bandwidth reserved on the first link is shared between the restoration paths of the two or more different primary paths.”

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants believe that the now-pending claims are in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants believe that the entire application is now in condition for allowance, and early and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Fees

During the pendency of this application, the Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge payment of any filing fees for presentation of extra claims under 37 CFR

1.16 and any patent application processing fees under 37 CFR 1.17 or credit any overpayment to Mendelsohn & Associates, P.C. Deposit Account No. 50-0782.

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to treat any concurrent or future reply, requiring a petition for extension of time under 37 CFR § 1.136 for its timely submission, as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time if not submitted with the reply.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 24-JAN-2008
Customer No. 46850
Mendelsohn & Associates, P.C.
1500 John F. Kennedy Blvd., Suite 405
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102

/Edward J. Meisarosh/
Edward J. Meisarosh
Registration No. 57,463
Attorney for Applicant
(215) 599-3639 (phone)
(215) 557-8477 (fax)